

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending, with claim 1 being the sole independent claim. Claim 1 has been amended. The amendments to claim 1 are made for clarification and do not require further search and consideration of the type prohibited after a final rejection. Accordingly, entry of the amendment to claim 1 is requested. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,106,277 (“*Tuckey*”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,121,021 (“*Ward*”). For the following reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejections are respectfully requested.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, “wherein the electric motor stator ring and an adjoining component of at least one of the motor casing and the magnet shells comprise a single-piece body formed as a single piece of a single material”. No new matter has been added. The combination of the cited art fails to teach or suggest this limitation.

The Examiner (at pg. 4 of the Office Action) has acknowledged that *Tuckey* fails to teach or suggest “a one-piece body comprising the stator ring (30) and an adjoining at least one motor casing or the magnet shells”, and cites *Ward* to provide “the final remaining element missing from that of the primary *Tuckey* reference”. Applicants, however, disagree that the combination of *Tuckey* and *Ward* achieves now amended independent claim 1.

The Examiner (at pg. 5 of the Office Action) asserts that:

The composite material is molded to the permanent magnet. It, accordingly, is another object of this invention to provide a method of manufacturing a frame and permanent magnet assembly where a composite material of the type described is molded to the permanent magnet.” (Column 1, lines 24-32).... [I]t can be seen that the stator ring and magnets are formed (i.e., molded) together as a single piece 14, and therefore meet the claimed limitation of a single-piece body”.

Applicants disagree that *Ward* provides what *Tuckey* lacks, i.e., “at least one of the motor casing and the magnet shells comprise a single-piece body formed as a single piece of a single material,” as recited in now amended independent claim 1.

Ward relates to “a frame and permanent magnet assembly for a dynamoelectric machine where the frame carries a plurality of permanent magnets. The frame is formed of iron powder particles that are bound together by a thermoplastic material” (see Abstract). More specifically, *Ward* discloses a frame and permanent magnet assembly 10 as a field assembly for a direct current machine with a wound armature or rotor (col. 1, lines 63-68; and Figs. 1-2 of *Ward*). The assembly 10 includes a frame 12 and two permanent magnets 14 (col. 2, lines 3-4 of *Ward*). *Ward* further discloses that during assembly, the composite material of frame 12 is injection molded to the magnets 14 (col. 4, lines 12-15).

The Examiner considers reference character 14 of *Ward* to be a stator ring-and-magnet assembly that interlocks into a motor casing. More specifically, the Examiner states in the final Office Action that reference character 14 is formed as a single piece made of a single material (see page 5, lines 16-20 of the Office Action). In contrast to the interpretation of *Ward* in the final Office Action, reference character 14 is specifically defined in *Ward* as the permanent magnets 14 that are carried by a frame 12. Furthermore, the permanent magnets 14 are held in a mold as the composite material of frame 12 is molded to the magnets 14.

Since *Ward* expressly discloses that the composite material of the frame 12 is molded onto the magnets 14 and the composite material is different than the material of the magnets, there is nothing in *Ward* that discloses “a stator ring and an adjoining component of at least one of the motor casing and the magnet shells that form a single-piece body formed as a single piece of a single material”, as expressly recited in independent claim 1. Therefore, the combination of

Tuckey and *Ward* fails to achieve now amended independent claim 1, because *Ward* fails to provide what *Tuckey* lacks.

If the teachings of *Ward* are applied to *Tuckey*, the stator ring 30 of *Tuckey* would be molded onto the permanent magnets 32 of *Tuckey*. Further, the stator ring 30 of *Tuckey* may comprise the composite material of the frame 12 taught by *Ward*. However, there is no teaching or suggestion that the stator ring 30 of *Tuckey* is made as a single piece with one of the motor casing or the magnet shells.

In view of the foregoing, amended independent claim 1 is patentable over the combination of *Tuckey* and *Ward*. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are therefore in order, and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

In view of the patentability of independent claim 1, dependent claims 2-7 are also patentable over the prior art for the reasons set forth above, as well as for the additional recitations contained therein.

Based on the foregoing remarks, this application is in condition for allowance. Early passage of this case to issue is respectfully requested.

It is believed that no fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the present application. However, if any fees or charges are required at this time, they may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,
COHEN PONTANI LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP

By /Alfred W. Froebrich/
Alfred W. Froebrich
Reg. No. 38,887
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: July 10, 2009